



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH RELATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS.

This treatise has not been written by a specialist in English with exclusive reference to English development, but it is the work of one more familiar with comparative linguistic studies. In Vol. X, pp. 335-354 of *THE JOURNAL* the writer has already outlined the general course of the development of the relative constructions in the different Germanic languages. There also English was treated. Even at that time the writer was conscious that his sketch of the English development was very incomplete and promised a fuller treatment later of the so-called omission of the relative. In his mind, however, also a number of other important questions had arisen and soon clamored for solution. Has the French influenced the English development as much as some German scholars claim? For years doubts with regard to some of these claims so confidently made would not be downed and gave the mind little rest until the resolution came to approach these questions a little closer. Little by little it became apparent that the whole development would have to be taken up again in detail as important additional facts had come to light in the course of the inquiry. Renewed study of the German growth also brought out new facts, which moreover illumine the English development.

In his work on this subject the writer used freely all the investigations of English and continental scholars and was thankful for the many happy suggestions he found. Notwithstanding the abundance of grammatical material offered in the many treatises and the manifold notes and glossaries in the special editions of English authors the writer has felt it his bounden duty to read the English authors themselves. He has read almost the entire printed literature up to A. D. 1450 and the principal works between that date and 1600. True ideas of English grammar can only be obtained from live English as found in the living language, or as preserved in printed documents or manuscripts. The conceptions of lexicographers

and grammarians are often at variance with each other and are often fundamentally wrong. Grammarians only too often treat important linguistic questions under the impression of preconceived ideas which have no basis in actual usage. Others try to solve difficult language problems *logically* without the necessary *historical* perspective. The vision of an editor of a special text is often also so hemmed in by the narrow boundaries of the particular dialect which he is studying that the general view is shut off. The student of language must always keep close to the actual records of speech and see that they are arranged according to the order of the time and place of their origin. It was often necessary for the writer to gallop thru extended stretches of literature. The reading of so many books was often very superficial and yet the writer has considerable confidence in his results. As he dashed thru these books he kept his eyes fixed upon certain grammatical constructions and noticed how they varied in the different centuries and the different parts of England. He left minor details to one side and kept constantly in view the main lines of the development.

There is no lack of detailed grammatical treatises of particular dialects, but we really need more of these hurried glances thru the different English dialects. The way seemed not unfrequently long and dreary when the attention was turned to the ideas of the authors themselves so largely theological and so often foreign to the thought of our own time, but it became full of intense interest when it became apparent from the study of these plain popular dialects that there was gradually forming a simple but strong and beautiful language which was destined to spread over a great portion of the earth. Anglo-Saxon, the literary language of the South, had, after the Norman conquest, gradually yielded to French and Latin. The native language, however, was not entirely abandoned for literary purposes. It gradually returned to favor until about 1250 it had gained the ascendancy. There was, however, nothing which might be called a literary language that was widely recognized as a standard. The writers in the different parts of England now employed their native local speech. These dialects were all very different

and yet were very much alike. Scholars have emphasized too much their differences. No one of these dialects was destined to supplant the others. The South did not gain such a decided victory over the North as in Germany. Northern usage in many important features gradually spread to the South. Scholars have emphasized too much the influence of the South and especially the Midland, and put too much stress upon the importance of the great writers such as Chaucer. The plain, terse, cogent English of the common people of the North was to leave its imprint upon the final form of the language that was to emerge from these dialects as the speech of England and a large part of the world. It was a great delight to the writer to watch the gradual spread of northern terseness and it has been to him a great pleasure to bring this vital character of English speech into connection with his theme of the English relative constructions, especially as first developed in the North.

The plain directness so characteristic of the English race manifests itself quite clearly in one of the oldest constructions of the English language—the so-called omission of the relative pronoun. The origin of this construction is not English, but Germanic or rather Indo-Germanic. While other peoples have discarded this old usage for finer and more intricate instruments of thought the English people has in large measure retained it in accordance with its natural trend to plain directness. There is in fact here no omission of a relative at all, but if anything is omitted it is a personal pronoun: “Here’s a gentlewoman [she] denies all” (Shakspeare’s *M. f. M.* 5. 1. 282). “I have a bag of money here [it] troubles me” (id. *Merry W. of W.* 2. 2. 179). The omission of the personal pronouns as indicated in the square brackets is very common in the older periods of the language, not only in such sentences but in general there was a tendency to withhold the personal pronouns as they were not felt as necessary to the thought. In each of these sentences from Shakspeare the construction is asyndetic, i. e. is without a connective, two propositions lie side by side without a formal connecting link, and yet the second proposition modifies in a certain sense the preceding proposition. Where as here the connection is loose

the construction is called parataxis, i. e. arranging side by side. Often the connection is very close so that the second proposition is evidently subordinate to the first: "You are one of those [,they] would have him wed again" (id. W. T. 5. 1. 23). "This is the man [,] I seek [him]" (id. "Troilus," 5. 8. 10). "Where is this cup [,] I call'd for [it]?" (id. Anth. a. Cleop. 2. 7. 59). Where as here the connection is close the construction is called hypotaxis. The distinction lies in the *thought*, there is no distinction in the *form*. In each case two propositions lie side by side. Modern feeling inclines to a formal expression for the hypotactical relation and inserts relative pronouns here and naturally interprets the omissions in the old syndetic hypotactical construction in accordance with modern usage and says that the omitted pronouns here are not "they," "him," "it," but "who," "whom," "that." In the earliest period, however, relative pronouns had not yet been created and of course could not be used and hence could not be supplied in thought. The expression "omission of the relative" is in the strict sense quite inaccurate. Originally, as we have seen, the two propositions lay side by side without any formal connecting link. The context alone suggested the degree of the closeness of the connection.

In the course of the later development relative pronouns gradually became established in usage to indicate the subordination and by a choice between these pronouns the connection could be indicated as loose or close, as for example "that" may indicate a close connection and "who" a loose relation. A still looser relation may be denoted by the use of a personal pronoun in the second proposition: "There is a man at the door who wants to see you," or still looser: "There is a man at the door, he wants to see you." While the degree of closeness cannot always even now be denoted accurately the frequent attempts to denote the degree of closeness by the choice of the proper relative indicate the trend of modern thought to find a formal expression for fine distinctions of thought. The older language was more simple but often at the same time more terse and forceful. The English people have appreciated the force of the older construction and still

often employ it. There has, however, from the very beginning of the historic period been a strong prejudice against it. It was considered by the learned Anglo-Saxon writers as less fine than distinct pronominal forms such as they found in Latin with which they were all intimately acquainted. Thus we find very little of it in the oldest documents that have come down to us, for this oldest literature was under strong Latin influence. The forceful old construction, however, suddenly appeared in wide use when the popular dialects began to be used after the Norman conquest. It had probably been alive throughout the oldest period but had not been employed in the literary language. This is shown by the fact that it frequently occurs in the Lindisfarne Glosses written about A. D. 950 at Durham. The author of these glosses was a northerner and glossed the Latin Gospels in his native Northumbrian. Likewise it was alive in all the English dialects. At the beginning of the fourteenth century northern writers in and around Durham used the construction with great freedom much as we find it later in Shakspeare. The Durham writers played the most important part in the literature of the first half of the fourteenth century and little by little as we shall see later certain features in the dialects of the North found favor further to the South. The recognition of our oldest relative construction was not so general in the south as the use of some other northern features. It is not quite true, however, that this oldest relative construction was a northern feature. It was probably well known in every dialect, for the writer has found cases in the speech of every section of England, but it was not a form that was generally recognized in the written language. Literary recognition came first in the North. Slowly but gradually it became established in the South. The writer can offer no reason why the North first made literary use of this construction. He rejects Professor Jespersen's new theory of Danish influence on the grounds that the construction is first found in the Lindisfarne Glosses where there seem to be no traces of Danish influence, while it is very rare in *Orrmulum* (about A. D. 1200) where there are evident signs of Danish influence. The North also in other respects first broke away from old literary tradition.

It does not seem possible to ascribe this strong northern influence to any great political influence exerted by Durham, nor to the influence of the Durham writers. Durham was in the fourteenth century an important center, but it does not seem plausible to explain the spread of northern speech in this way. Northern English was the first to throw off the old declensions and to shorten words. There was there a marked tendency to *monosyllabic form*, which is today a prominent characteristic of the English language. The terseness of the North found a sympathetic hearing among the immediate neighbors to the South, for similar tendencies were also developing there. The literary documents in the Midland show that the literary language there gradually abandoned its older and longer forms for shorter and simpler ones. At the same time we can notice the spread of the terse asyndetic relative construction. The general tendency of the North toward terseness spread to the Midland and from there passed to the South. This general tendency found in general little favor with Chaucer, for here as elsewhere Chaucer did not reflect popular usage. Chaucer instead of crystalizing English usage retarded it. He was not in full sympathy with the simple and terse English which was used in the North and probably in a much more limited extent and modified form also employed by plain folk in his own native town. It was, however, this simple and terse language that was destined finally to carry the day. The present literary language is traceable to the speech of London, which was originally southern in character and later was gradually in its essential features conformed to the midland type and still later was in large measure influenced by the simpler tendencies of the North. This trend toward simplicity reached in a number of respects its fullest and most complete expression in Shakespeare. Since his time the old asyndetic relative construction has lost a good deal of its former favor in literature and even in colloquial language has much narrower boundaries than in the sixteenth century. In the nominative relation it is now rarely heard. We occasionally hear it in certain expressions: "There is a man at the door wants to see you." In a well-known floral guide are the words: "Here's a book will tell

you how to select." The following sentence we must read several times before we understand it: "Those men blush not in actions blacker than the night will shun no course to keep them from the light." (Shakspeare's "Pericl. 1, 1, 135). It is evident that in the nominative relation this construction is often ambiguous or unclear. Perspicuity is the highest law of language and it is manifest that in the nominative relation this construction is doomed. Shakspeare was often willing to assume the risk of unclearness to attain the terseness and forcefulness of the old construction. In reading his dramas we have often felt that modern English character has lost its former dash in the personal expression of its inner life. In the accusative relation, on the other hand, this construction still has wide boundaries, much wider, however, in colloquial speech than in the literary language. The old prejudice against this construction has survived. Little narrow-minded grammarians and school-teachers who have no knowledge of the historical development here and little insight into linguistic principles are still at their old work of limiting the use of this construction. These little fellows only know the little rules they have learned in their school-books. It is very sad but true that coming generations will learn in large part their English, not from Shakspeare, but from the little wights who guard so faithfully their little rules. It is quite clear where we are drifting, but the writer desires to turn the attention away from the future to the past, to the earliest forms of this old asyndetic construction and then later follow the development of the different relative pronouns.

In order to get a clear idea of the asyndetic relative construction and the later development of the relative pronouns it is necessary to begin the study in the oldest period where the forms are inflected and the case relations are perfectly clear. Unfortunately the simplest asyndetic form is little used in Anglo-Saxon. As it is helpful to see this original form in actual language illustrations are given from the kindred German which will throw full light upon the English development. Later the few traces of this construction in Anglo-Saxon will be given.



As in both parataxis and hypotaxis the two propositions of a sentence often lie side by side without any formal connecting link; the closeness of the connection in the thought alone distinguishes the two forms of statement. The distinction is often very slight. Thus in "Mit sehn gewan er küende /erbûwens lands, hiez Ascalun" (Wolfram's "Parzival," 398.22-3) "He caught sight of an inhabited place which was called Ascalon." We can assume that the connection between the propositions is rather loose as we can easily pause after the first proposition and then begin a new sentence, while in "Wir gewunn ein wurz heizt trachontê" (ib. 483.6) "We found a plant which is called dragonwort" the connection seems a trifle closer, as the indefinite article in spite of its name often has a slight shade of definiteness. It sometimes even has almost the force of a definite article: "Wer was ein man lac vorme grâl?" (ib. 501.20 "Who was the man who lay before the Grail?"; literally "Who was a certain man?, [he] lay before the Grail." It is usually difficult in sentences which thus contain an indefinite article to draw a sharp line between parataxis and hypotaxis as there is no formal distinction between the constructions. Hypotaxis is usually indicated by the employment of the *definite* article and in this way differentiates itself in form from parataxis: "Der möchte mich ergetzen niht des mærs mir iwer munt vergiht" (ib. 476, 17-18") "It (i. e. the Grail, couldn't divert my mind from the sad story (which) you have just related to me," literally "it couldn't divert my mind from the sad story, your mouth relates [it] to me." The definite article which is a weak demonstrative points to the following asyndetic relative clause. There is often as here an omitted personal pronoun in the subordinate clause. The omission brings the two propositions closer together and is a primitive step in the direction of a formal expression for the hypotactical relation. The omitted personal pronoun here is "es," the genitive object of "vergiht." It can also be in the nominative or any other case: "Dechein sûl stuont dar unde / diu sich geglichen kunde der grôzen sûl dâ zwischen stuont" (ib. 589.29) "No column stood there that could be compared to the large column that stood in the middle." The omitted personal pronoun in the

subordinate clause is "siu" *it*, the subject of the second "stuont." The well-known grammarian Hermann Wunderlich has failed to see the real situation here as he has stated on page 285 of "Der deutsche Satzbau" that the omitted pronoun is always in the accusative or some other oblique case in hypotaxis and is in the nominative only in parataxis.

The definite article may also follow the governing noun when it is the antecedent: "Dô sageter Parzivâle danc / prises *des* erwarp sîn hant" (ib. 156, 12-13) "He then thanked Parzival for the honor (which) he had won," literally "Then he thanked Parzival for honor, that one, his hand had won [it]." The position of the definite article or rather demonstrative "des" here is very important, for the relative pronoun "der" developed in just such sentences. The demonstrative stands at the end of the first proposition and points to the following asyndetic relative clause. The article can precede the antecedent and the demonstrative may follow it: "*Thie* furiston *thiz* [=thie iz] gisahun, es harto hintarquamun" (Otfrid, IV. 4. 71) "The high priests who saw it were sore afraid," literally "The high priests, those, [they] saw it, were sore afraid." Both the definite article and the demonstrative "thie" point as with hands to the following asyndetic relative clause " [they] saw it." Of course the personal pronoun "they" does not actually occur in the sentence, for as we have seen above it was usually omitted in the subordinate clause. It is here assumed that the "thie" contained in "thiz" is still a demonstrative, but this is not certain. It may already have been felt as a relative pronoun, for it is a nominative and may be the subject of the relative clause, but on the other hand it may also be construed as demonstrative belonging to "furiston" and placed at the end of the principal proposition that it may point to the following clause. No formal criterion can settle the question. In the preceding sentence from Wolfram the corresponding form, the genitive "des," is beyond doubt a demonstrative, for the construction in the following subordinate clause requires an accusative, not a genitive. Thus we can often distinguish whether the construction is demonstrative or relative by the case form. Originally the construction was always demonstrative. As the case form demanded by

the main proposition was often as in the sentence from Otfrid the same as that required in the subordinate clause it was often doubtful to which proposition the demonstrative belonged. Gradually under the influence of Latin models the demonstrative passed from the main proposition to the subordinate clause and became a relative pronoun.

In the preceding paragraph the asyndetic relative clauses modified nouns, but they might also restrict demonstratives: "Gott hüete al *der* ich lâze hie." (Wolfram's "Parzival," 324.29) "May God protect all those I leave here." It is perfectly clear that "*der*" is a demonstrative, the genitive object of the very "hüete." Also here it is not correct to speak of the omission of a relative. It is again a personal pronoun that is omitted: "May God protect all those, I leave [them] here." The omission of the personal pronoun is still the rule in English asyndetic hypotaxis, which thus preserves a very ancient type of sentence. In such sentences as: "Ich bin ouch *der* in nie gesach" (ib. 751.2) "I am also one who has never seen him" the form "*der*" may belong to either the principal proposition or the subordinate clause. Just as after nouns it gradually came to be felt as belonging to the subordinate clause and thus developed into a real relative pronoun.

Just as in the case of a noun antecedent where there were often two demonstratives, one before the noun in the form of the definite article and one at the end of the proposition pointing to the following clause there was also in the case of a demonstrative antecedent often a repetition of the demonstrative: "Ni intwirit worold ellu *thes* wiht, *thes* ih thir zellu" (Otfrid II. 12.20) "The whole world will not disprove any of these things, these things (that) I shall tell you." Here the construction is still demonstrative. This repetition of the demonstrative is the origin of the so called correlative construction. Originally the demonstrative was repeated as it was needed at the end of the proposition to point to the following asyndetic relative clause. In course of time the second demonstrative lost much of its originally strong stress and glided over into the following clause as a relative correlative to the antecedent demonstrative: "Ni ward ther than tho funtan, der wolti widarstantan" (Otfrid II. 11.27) "No one

was found there who would resist," originally "That one was not found there, that one, [he] would resist." In Otfrid's sentence it is not sure whether the construction is relative or a demonstrative as the case form of the second demonstrative would admit of either interpretation. In course of time, however, it was felt as relative. This double demonstrative became a very productive new relative type. In the older periods the single demonstrative type was more common than the double form but later the singular demonstrative form was almost entirely replaced by the new double or correlative type.

In the *single* demonstrative type described in the paragraph just before the preceding one there were two quite different forms. In the first form the demonstrative stands in the principal proposition: "So wer so ouh muas eigi, gebe *demo*, ni eigi" (Otfrid I. 24.7) "Whoever has food let him give of it to him who hasn't any." Here the demonstrative has the case form demanded by the verb of the principal proposition. In the second form the demonstrative stands in the second proposition and has the case form required by the verb of this proposition: "Mit des grâls insigel hie kumt uns *des* wir gerten ie" ("Parzival," 792. 29-30) "Here comes to us with the seals of the Grail he for whom we have been yearning so long." Mr. Gustav Neckel who discusses these two forms in his interesting little book "Über die altgermanischen Relativsätze," Palaestra V comes to the conclusion that the position of the demonstrative is regulated by the case form demanded by the verbs of the two propositions. The demonstrative stands in that proposition in which there is a verb that requires a genitive or dative: "Ahzehen wochen hete gelebt/*des* muoter mit dem tôde strebt" ("Parzival" 109. 5-6) "He had lived eighteen weeks whose mother is now struggling with death." Mr. Neckel thinks that a nominative or accusative can easily be supplied in thought and hence the subject is here understood, while the genitive "des" is expressed, as a genitive or dative cannot be so easily supplied in thought. Thus according to Mr. Neckel it is a mere question of case form. The writer has collected a large number of examples which do not confirm this rule. From these examples it becomes

apparent that the law involved is not a formal one, but is based upon the meaning. The demonstrative stands in the first proposition where the second proposition is clearly subordinate and restricts the meaning of the first one closely: "ein teil *des* ich von iu verlôs" ("Parzival," 327.11) "a part of that (which) I lost thru you." On the other hand, the demonstrative stands in the second proposition whenever that proposition contains an important independent fact: "Du zihst in [des] daz doch nie geschah" (ib. 352.20) "You accuse him of that which surely never took place." The second proposition is not a restrictive clause but an independent and very positive utterance of the very positive little Obilot. The idea of an independent statement is also indicated by the use of the demonstrative in the second proposition. We usually find here in restrictive clauses a personal pronoun which is usually of so little weight that it is omitted. This demonstrative is not a relative that has glided over into the subordinate clause from the principal proposition where it was originally a demonstrative, but it originally stood in the second proposition and has been retained on account of its importance. Notice that the demonstrative "des" has been omitted in the principal proposition, while according to Mr. Neckel's rule it ought to be expressed and the nominative "das" should be omitted. The "des" is omitted here because the following proposition is not a restrictive clause but an almost independent statement, hence it is not needed to point forward to the following restriction. Likewise in the example from "Parzival" 109. 5-6, quoted by Mr. Neckel as given above. In this spirited sentence of the great poet there are two almost independent statements, an unborn child had been living and developing for eighteen weeks, its mother was struggling with death. Likewise in 148. 28-9: "Sus wart für Artûsen brâht an dem got wunsches het erdâht" "Thus there was brought before Arthur that one upon whom God had bestowed the most beautiful gifts." There is no need here to describe the person brought before the king. We know that it is Parzival. The poet gives in his second proposition not a restriction for the identification of the person, but adds an independent statement about him. While the two propositions

are almost independent the omission of the pronominal subject of the first one indicates a relation between them, a loose relation, parataxis. The omission of the pronoun in the second proposition and the use of the demonstrative at the end of the first one pointing to a following restriction denotes a closer relation, hypotaxis: "Die man sie gar verswuor, wan *den* sie got bewiste" (ib. 824.24-5) "She renounced men except the one whom God would assign to her." The demonstrative "den" is here used to point to the following restrictive clause. The personal object of the verb in the restrictive clause is a personal pronoun in the genitive, but it is omitted in accordance with common usage, while it ought to be expressed and "den" omitted according to Mr. Neckel's rule, for according to him we could easily supply the accusative "den." In fact, however, "den" cannot be omitted, for it points to the following restriction. Thus the writer sees in these two constructions the clever attempt of the older period to give formal expression to the idea of parataxis and hypotaxis. These two older types are not always consistently followed as they are not even in the oldest period clearly felt, for the new correlative type with entirely new grammatical conceptions had already obscured the older ideas. Later the correlative type gained almost a complete victory over the older forms. The older type is now only used in the masculine and feminine with definite reference: "*Die* ich meine heisst Frau Findelklee" (Hauptmann's "Versunkene Glocke," Act. 2.1.1047.) The Correlative type, i. e. "die die" instead of simple "die" is also used here and is even more common than the older single form. In English the correlative type has also prevailed in the literary language, but in colloquial speech the older hypotactic asyndetic construction can still be used. We can translate Wolfram's "Dô kam von dem ich sprechen will ("Parzival," 132.28) by "then came that one I shall speak of." The translation, however, is not accurate. Wolfram used the old paratactic asyndetic type, while the modern English form is hypotactic with a demonstrative pointing to a following restriction. It fact there is no restriction here. Wolfram actually says: "Then came a man, of that one I shall now have something to say." The

second proposition is not a restriction but the more important of the two statements. Thus we do not in modern German or English pay any attention to the thought distinction observed in the older periods, but employ uniformly the correlative type and in English in addition also the hypotactic form of the asyndetic construction. The impelling force in both languages is the modern desire to indicate hypotaxis, to employ hypotactic form where there is the slightest relation, sometimes even where the independence of statement ought to be emphasized rather than its dependence. Thus *thought* has been sacrificed to *form*. The development of hypotaxis has in general made modern speech much more accurate and elegant, but it has at points, as here, weakened the expression of thought and feeling. A clear insight into our loss here ought to spur us to resist somewhat the hypotactical tendency and to hold on to some of the old things that have come down to us charged with the vigor of simpler and more energetic thought and feeling.

The asyndetic relative construction following a noun or demonstrative antecedent as illustrated in the preceding paragraphs was never very common in the older German periods, but it is quite common in Otfrid and Wolfram. The two largest Germans of the older periods and the largest Englishman were all very fond of this construction. The simplest explanation is that they were all in close touch with national life. In England the literary language of the South had in the oldest period barred this native method of expression almost entirely out. Later the rise of the dialects brought it into favor. In Germany, on the other hand, it was much more common in the oldest period and later gradually disappeared. The largest men were naturally more independent in language and their strong thought and feeling broke through the artificial barriers and sought natural channels of expression. At first it seems rather strange to find such a very free use of this construction in so late an author as Wolfram. At the close of the Old High German period the construction was very little used, even in such an important and vigorous writer as Notker. Then came Wolfram who used it very freely and in every form known in the oldest period. Notker was a learned man under

Latin influence. Wolfram, as he tells us himself, could neither read nor write. Some scholars regard Wolfram's utterance as one of his many jokes. It seems to them impossible that one who has found a beautiful expression for the most wholesome and profound philosophy of human living propounded by any of the older German writers could be without a knowledge of the art of reading and writing. It has been to the present writer a source of pleasure and inspiration in the last fifteen years to lead each year young people to this foundation of wholesome philosophy, but the conviction has steadily grown that Wolfram has told the truth. This language so full of asyndesis is the expression of one unacquainted with scholarly linguistic Latin learning. It is a free and natural expression of one used to speaking rather than writing. Under this impression the writer turned to Hans Sachs to see if in this simple man of the people the old asyndetic construction might in a much later period still be found. Asyndetic parataxis is very common. His works fairly abound in such sentences as: "Gen Augspurg kam ein edelman, / der het ein knecht, [er] hiess Grobian" ("Die klain fischlein," 11. 1-2). "Vor langer zeit ein pawer sas in Payern, [er] alt von jaren was" ("Die fabel von dem Pawren, wolff und füechs," 11.1.2). Often the two propositions lie side by side, each a complete sentence: "Auch ist ain spil, haist man das puecken" ("Der verspilte rewter"). We find this complete form also in close hypotaxis. "Mein Herr, ich bin der man, / die Männer ich gefressen han, / die selber waren Herr im Haus" ("Der Narrenfresser," 11. 59-61). This interesting sentence has all the earmarks of primitive German. The definite article before "man" points to the following restrictive asyndetic relative clause. Also the more common hypotactic type with omitted pronoun is found, both after a noun and a demonstrative antecedent. The omitted pronoun may be in the nominative relation: "Weil der frid ist das hohest güet / all creatur erfrewen thuet" (Fabel des fuechs mit der schlangen," 11.35-6). "Da hört er das im nit gefiel" ("Der sailler erstach den münich und sein weib," 1.15.). The omitted pronoun may be in the accusative relation or in some other oblique case: "Mein speis die was / allein das fleisch der Thier ich ass" ("Löwin mit



ihren Jungen," 11. 26-7). The hypotactic construction, however, is very rare in Hans Sachs. Also Luther offers but a few examples. It is quite evident that while the paratactic construction was very common at this period the hypotactic form had almost disappeared. The Latin type had gradually supplanted the native German form.

In the oldest English period there are very few examples of the simple type of asyndesis discussed above. This is of course not a natural condition of things because the further we go back the commoner it ought to be. In the documents that have come down to us it is most common in *parataxis* where the omitted pronoun is in the nominative relation: "Sum welig man wæs hæfde sumne gerefan" (Luke 16.1, Corpus MS.) "There was a certain rich man who had a steward." The Latin original "quidam erat diues *qui* habebat uilicium" shows clearly hypotactic form by the use of the relative "qui." In Latin "qui" usually indicates a close connection, but it is also employed as here where the connection was loose. The Anglo-Saxon translator here followed his English speech-feeling and deviated from the Latin model. As we have seen above the old asyndetic construction resisted also in German the Latin type the most successfully in *parataxis*, for the Latin original seemed at this point entirely too foreign. The English translator made a distinction in his translation between close and loose connection, although in his native idiom he used the asyndetic construction in both cases. It was natural for him to bring together, i. e. to speak in one breath what was related. To the Germanic mind hypotactical form was something new and foreign. It grasped the idea that the most *common* and *characteristic* force of "qui" was to indicate *close* connection i. e. that it introduced a restrictive clause. Wherever the connection was close both English and German writers under the influence of the Latin avoided carefully their native asyndetic construction, but they still yielded frequently to their natural inclination to bring related things together in asyndetic form wherever the connection was not close. It seems at first more natural that they would use asyndesis where the connection was close, for it was a Germanic tendency to bring together what was closely related,

but they had observed that close connection was denoted in Latin by an especial word and among English and German writers it became a fixed goal to find for this idea a formal expression in some native word. This more frequent use of hypotactic form for close connection than for loose resulted for the most part from the peculiar form of the Germanic sentence here. As we have seen above a demonstrative pronoun stood at the end of the principal proposition pointing to the following restrictive clause. Under the influence of the Latin this demonstrative developed into a relative pronoun. There was no such demonstrative in sentences where the connection was loose and the use of hypotaxis was quite unnatural and developed very slowly.

The commonest use of the asyndetic *hypotaxis* in Old English is where the antecedent is a demonstrative. The omitted pronoun may be in the nominative case: "Lisse selle . . . . þam þe wirðiað" (Genesis, 1757) "I offer favor to those who honor thee." The omitted pronoun may be in some oblique case: "Wiste forwohrte þa he ær wite sealde" (ib., 857) "He knew those to be guilty to whom he had given beauty." "Gode þancode . . . þæs se man gespræc" ("Beowulf," 1398) "He thanked God for that which the man had spoken." The pronoun in the relative clause may be expressed as in case of the language of Hans Sachs described above: "And þær is mid Estum an mægð þæt hi magon cyle gewyrcean" (King Alfred's "Voyage of Wulfstan") "There is among the Esthonians one tribe which can create cold," literally "one tribe, that one, they can create cold." The neuter demonstrative as in this example is sometimes used with reference to persons. Likewise in the following example where the pronoun in the relative clause is omitted: "Hwa is þæt þe slog?" (Matth. 26, 68, Rushworth Glosses) "Who is he that smote thee?", literally "Who is that one?, [he] smote thee." Later in Middle English "that" regularly points to persons or things.

The asyndetic construction is more common where the antecedent as in all these examples is a demonstrative than where it is a noun because the demonstrative has become associated with the Latin relative, and although it is in fact not a relative and as a demonstrative had the construction of

the principal proposition it is in the feeling of the grammarian an approach to the Latin form if not a full equivalent. The demonstrative often as in the preceding examples stood at the end of the principal proposition so that it stood between the two propositions as the Latin relative. This old type is still used quite commonly where there is definite reference: "this fruit and *that* I bought yesterday." It has, however, entirely disappeared where the reference is general and indefinite, i. e. in clauses which we now regard as substantive clauses. As the demonstrative "that" has definite meaning there arose in course of time the feeling that a more indefinite word would be better suited to the indefinite force that naturally belongs to a neuter pronoun which without definite reference is used as the subject or object in a substantive clause. In spite of the conflict between the indefinite force of "that" in substantive clauses and its definite meaning when used elsewhere it was only after a long struggle that it was supplanted in this function by some other word. It is still used by Shakspeare: "I earn *that* I eat, get *that* I wear" ("As you like it," 3, 2, 76). Although this simple form was common here in Oldest English the fuller form with "ðe" described at length below also occurred: "ne herigen þætte [= þæt ðe] unnyttre is" (King Alfred's "Boethius," Sedgefield's ed. p. 72) "Nor praise what is useless," literally "Nor praise *that there*, [it] is useless." In Middle English "þæt ðe" became "that that." This double form also came from another source: "þæt god gesamnode ne syndrige þæt nan man" (Mark 10.9. Corpus MS.) "That [which] God has joined together let no man put (that) asunder." Both "þæt's" here were originally demonstratives, but the double form led to the idea of correlatives and brought about a real relative construction: "Ne nan man ne mæg . . . him gedon þæt hit sie ðæt ðæt hit ne bið" (King Alfred's "Boethius," p. 36) "No one can cause him (an intelligent man) to be *that which* or *what* he is not." "*That that* is, is" (Shakspeare's "Twelfth N." IV. 2). This double form and the other single "that" were later supplanted by "that which" or more commonly "what," the latter of which forms appeared very early in Middle English. The correlatives "that which" appeared much later, for the original use

of "which" after an antecedent was for definite, precise reference and hence it could not be employed after indefinite "that." Even today "that which" is not as common as "what." There is one place, however, where it is exclusively used, namely in definitions: "That which separates one part of a surface from an adjoining point is called a line." This brings out the real difference between "that which" and "what." The former is a little more definite, although in general they both are general and indefinite and usually have much the same meaning.

Asyndetic hypotaxis is in Oldest English not only found after a simple demonstrative, but it also occurs sometimes after a pleonastic demonstrative that repeats a preceding demonstrative and stands *after* the governing noun so that it may point to the following syndetic relative clause: *þæt is se Abraham se him engla god naman niwan asceop*" ("Exodus," 380) "That is that Abraham to whom the God of the angels gave a new name," literally "That Abraham, that one, the God of the angels gave him a new name." It is evident that the "se" here is a demonstrative, as it has the case required by the verb of the principal proposition. Where, however, the case demanded by the principal proposition is the same as that required by the verb of the subordinate clause it is impossible to tell whether the demonstrative belongs to the principal proposition or the subordinate clause: "Se dema *se* ðæt ingeðonc eal wat, he eac ðæm ingeðonce demð" ("Pastoral Care," Sweet 38.11) "The judge who knows the inner thoughts judges the inner thoughts." In such sentences the demonstrative gradually developed into a relative and passed from the principal proposition to the subordinate clause.

The asyndetic hypotactic construction is in oldest English very rare where the antecedent is a *noun*. In the first example in the preceding paragraph the antecedent is a noun, but it is followed by a demonstrative which is felt as the real antecedent. In oldest West Saxon, the literary language of the South, hypotactic asyndesis is carefully avoided where the antecedent is a noun. Also in the Gospels in the Corpus MS. written about A. D. 1000 there is not the slightest tendency

toward asyndesis, nor is there any further advance in Layamon's "Brut" written about 1205. This must simply be literary usage, for asyndetic hypotaxis is common in the Lindisfarne Glosses written near Durham about 950. The writer believes he has made here an important discovery, for he cannot find anywhere in learned literature any mention of asyndetic hypotaxis in these glosses. The language of these glosses has been carefully studied by able scholars with regard to its phonology and inflectional systems, but the syntax has been slighted on the general grounds that the syntax of a dialect cannot be accurately determined from mere glosses. It will appear, however, from the examples given below that the frequent use of asyndetic hypotaxis in these glosses is beyond doubt. This Durham usage acquires additional importance when brought into relation to the many other features of the north English dialects that indicate a general trend in the North toward terseness and directness, such as the shortening of words by the dropping of endings, the tendency to discard grammatical gender, etc. The use of asyndetic hypotaxis while it is among other northern features which indicate a fondness for terse expression, must not be thought of as of northern origin. It was primitive Germanic. It was preserved in North English because North Englishmen spoke their native dialect. In every West Germanic dialect asyndesis was a common feature. As we shall see later the writer of the Lindisfarne Glosses was influenced in his translation by his Latin model, but there is in his usage no fixed convention that proscribes asyndesis and he often employs it in contrast to the Latin original.

*Northwestern University.*

GEORGE O. CURME.

*(To be continued)*